



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/771,102

01/26/2001

Jeremy M. Ford

16356.752

7708

7590

05/21/2004

DAVID L. MCCOMBS  
HAYES AND BOONE, LLP  
901 MAIN STREET, SUITE 3100  
DALLAS, TX 75202-3789

EXAMINER

CHAU, COREY P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2644

9

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/771,102

Applicant(s)

FORD, JEREMY M.

Examiner

Corey P Chau

Art Unit

2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01/26/01 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:  
On page 10, line 19, "SW11and" should be replaced with "SW11 and"  
On page 10, line 21, "will me" should be replaced with "will be". Appropriate correction is required.
3. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities:  
On lines 3 and 4, "supply sulosystem" should be replaced with "supply subsystem". Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. In regards to Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 it is unclear as to what "the switch" in Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, and 8 is referring to base on the antecedent basis from Claim 1, it appear that "the switch" should refers to SW2, however "the switch" seem to describe the behavior of SW1 of the specification and therefore it is not clear as to what is intended to be Claimed. Revisions to the Claims are requested.

7. Claims 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11 has not been further treated on the merits due to it being dependent upon a rejected Claim.

8. In regards to Claim 32, it is unclear as to what "the switch" in Claim 32 is referring to base on the antecedent basis from Claim 28, it appear that "the switch" should refers to SW2, however "the switch" seem to describe the behavior of SW1 of the specification and therefore it is not clear as to what is intended to be claimed. A revision to the Claim is requested.

9. Claims 34, 35, 37, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. In regards to Claims 34, 35, 37, 38, and 39, it is unclear as to what the operation of the first and second switch is intended to be based on the condition of the detection of external speakers. The specification disclosure of the operation of the first and second switch is differ from that of Claims 34, 35, 37, 38, and 39 in that the absence of external speakers the second switch is connected to the second voltage supply and in the presence of external speakers the second switch is connected to the first voltage supply. Revisions to the Claims are requested.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1, 6, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5194821 to Brambilla.

13. Regarding Claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses an audio system of a PC (page 1, paragraphs 0004 and 006; page 2, paragraph 0010) comprising a voltage regulator in series with a power amplifier supply path to reject random noise (i.e. a first voltage supply) (page 2, paragraph 0015); a second voltage supply (30); an audio amplifier (10); means for connecting a first speaker to the audio amplifier (Fig. 1); a jack for coupling a second speaker to the audio amplifier (Fig. 1); and a jack-sense line coupled to the jack (50), the jack-sense line assuming a first condition when a speaker is connected to the jack and assuming a second condition when a speaker is not connected to the jack (page 2, paragraphs 0011-0012). Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose a switch coupled to the first voltage supply, to the second voltage supply, and to the audio amplifier. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide such a switch coupled to the first voltage supply, to the second voltage supply, and to the audio

amplifier to operate in response to the first condition of the jack-sense line and in response to the second condition of the jack-sense line, in order realize the needed switch to provide an appropriate voltage supply to the audio amplifier upon detection of the jack sense condition, so that for a single-ended mode will not result in excessive power losses in the bridged mode and the bridged mode will not result in exacerbated power supply noise in the single-ended mode (page 1, paragraph 0006), therefore optimize performance in both a bridged mode as well as in a single-ended mode (page 2, paragraph 0016), as taught by Brambilla for example.

14. Regarding Claim 6, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses the audio amplifier (10) includes a noninverting stage (12) and an inverting stage (11) and wherein the first speaker (20) is coupled across an output of the noninverting stage and an output of the noninverting stage (Fig. 1).

15. Claim 12 is essentially similar to Claims 1 and 6 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claims 1 and 6.

16. All elements of Claim 13 are comprehended by Claim 1. Claim 13 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claim 1.

17. All elements of Claim 14 are comprehended by Claim 1. Claim 14 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claim 1.

18. Claim 16 is essentially similar to Claim 1 and is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claim 1. Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses an audio system of a PC and it is inherent that the personal computer chassis has a connector

for a primary system speakers and a jack for a secondary speakers system, an audio amplifier system including an audio amplifier enclosed within the computer chassis.

19. Regarding Claim 17, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses the audio amplifier (10) includes an inverting stage (11) having an inverting output (112) and a noninverting stage (12) having a noninverting output (122) and wherein the connector (20,21,22) is coupled between the inverting output and the noninverting output and the jack is connected between (i) either the inverting output or the noninverting output and (ii) GND (40).

20. All elements of Claim 18 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 16. Claim 18 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 16.

21. All elements of Claim 20 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 16. Claim 20 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 16.

22. Claim 22 is essentially similar to Claim 1 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claim 1.

23. Regarding Claim 23, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses detecting is effected through the operation of a jack-sense indicator (50).

24. All elements of Claim 24 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 22. Claim 24 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 22.

25. All elements of Claim 25 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 22. Claim 25 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 22.

26. All elements of Claim 27 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 22. Claim 27 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 22.

27. Claim 28 is essentially similar to Claim 1 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claim 1.

28. All elements of Claim 29 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 28. Claim 29 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 28.

29. Claim 30 is essentially similar to Claim 6 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claim 6.

30. All elements of Claim 31 are comprehended by Claims 1 and 28. Claim 31 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1 and 28.

31. Claim 33 is essentially similar to Claim 1 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claim 1.

32. Claims 15, 19, 21, 26 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5818291 to Tiede.

33. Regarding Claim 15, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses a voltage regulator (i.e. first voltage supply) and the second voltage supply is a high-current supply (pages 1 and 2, paragraph 0009). Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses a voltage regulator, but only generally; no specific software or hardware is taught. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to seek known types of voltage regulators. Tiede for example discloses a low current voltage regulator. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at



the time the invention was made to utilize any known types of voltage regulators in Applicant's admitted prior art as modified, such as that of Tiede.

34. Claim 19 is essentially similar to Claim 15 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claim 15.

35. All elements of Claim 21 are comprehended by Claims 1, 15 and 16. Claim 21 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1, 15 and 16.

36. Claim 26 is essentially similar to Claim 15 and is rejected for the reasons state above apropos to Claim 15.

37. All elements of Claim 36 are comprehended by Claims 1, 15 and 33. Claim 36 is rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claims 1, 15 and 33.


### ***Conclusion***

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey P Chau whose telephone number is (703)305-0683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W Isen can be reached on (703)305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 17, 2004

  
**FORESTER W. ISEN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**